IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY NINETH DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

**THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE B. SUDERSHAN REDDY**

**and**
**THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.C. BHANU**

**WRIT PETITION NO : 12993 of 1995**

Between:

**Medarmitla Venugopal Rao S/o narasimham**
**Venkatakrishnapuram (V), Marripudi (M),**
**Prakasam Dist.**

..... PETITIONER

**AND**

**1 The Mandal Revenue Officer (Election Officer)**
**Marripudi Mandal, Prakasam District**
**2 The Revenue Divisional Officer**
**Kandukuru Division, Prakasam Dist.**
**3 The Govt. of A.P. rep. by Secretary**
**Panchayat RajWing Development, Dept., VII, Secretaraiat,**
**Hyderabad**
**4 The State Election Commission**
**A.P. Budha Bhavan, Hyderabad.**
**Respondents 4 to 6 are impleaded as per Court order dt; 29/6/95 in wpmp 16171/95**
**5 Mukunda Jagan Mohan Rao**
**Respondents 4 to 6 are impleaded as per Court order**
**dt; 29/6/95 in wpmp 16171/95**
**6 Mukunda Venkata Subbamma**
**Respondents 4 to 6 are impleaded as per Court order dt; 29/6/95 in wpmp 16171/95**

.....RESPONDENT(S)

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the

circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to to issue a writ or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to set aside the unanimous election of Mukunda Venkata Subbamma for the post of Member of Ward No.2 and Mukunda Jagan Mohan Rao for the post of Member of Ward No.5 of Venkata Krishnapuram Gram Panchayat of Marripudi (M), Prakasam Dist., by declaring the action of the respondents is illegal, improper and voilation of the provisions of A.P.Gram Panchayat (Reservation for the posts of Sarpanch and Ward Members) Rules 1955 and pass

**Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.S.NARENDRANATH REDDY**

**Counsel for the Respondent No.: GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ & RURAL DEV.**

The Court made the following :

O r d e r: (Per BRSR, J)

The cause in this writ petition does not survive requiring any further adjudication, since the issue relates to validity of the order passed by the Returning Officer accepting the nomination of the respondents 5 and 6 for the elections held in the year 1995.

The writ petition shall stand accordingly dismissed.

_____

**B.Sudershan Reddy, J.**

_____

**K.C. Bhanu, J.**